

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance are respectfully requested. No new matter is added by the amendments herein.

Claims 1, 5-12, 16-22, and 26-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,115,074 to Ozkan, et al. ("Ozkan"). Claims 2-4, 13-15, and 23-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ozkan in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,675,385 to Wang ("Wang").

Applicant respectfully traverses all rejections in view of the amendments and remarks herein.

Independent Claim 1

Independent claim 1 as amended recites retrieving a set of tuning parameters for a requested one of a plurality of provided services by accessing a database through one of a plurality of service identifiers, wherein the database comprises the following information items: the plurality of service identifiers identifying the plurality of provided services, and a plurality of sets of tuning parameters, each of the sets being associated with a respective one of the plurality of service identifiers; and using the retrieved tuning parameters for tuning a receiver, wherein the database comprises at least two identical service identifiers.

Ozkan fails to teach or suggest a database having at least two identical service identifiers, as now claimed. The Office Action refers to (in rejecting claims 5 and 6) Ozkan at col. 2, line 65 to col. 3, line 9, to show identical service identifiers. However, this portion of Ozkan merely discloses that the invention may be applied to various types of systems in which the coding type of modulation format may be varied. This does not support the idea of two identical service identifiers as claimed. Nor does any other portion of Ozkan teach or suggest two identical service identifiers.

For at least this reason, it is submitted that claim 1 as amended is not anticipated by Ozkan. Nor does Wang make up for this deficiency of Ozkan.

Dependent Claims 6, 17, 27, and 34

Claim 6 recites that retrieving a set of tuning parameters comprises selecting the most recently used of the at least two identical service identifiers. In rejecting this claim, the Office Action refers to Ozkan at col. 6, lines 11-41. This portion of Ozkan discloses that individual program

channels are allocated both a first major identification number and a second sub-identification number. Each program is thus identified by a combination of the first and second identification numbers. However, this is not relevant to selecting the most recently used of at least two identical service identifiers, as claimed. Nor does any other portion of Ozkan teach or suggest this feature. In addition, Wang fails to overcome this deficiency of Ozkan.

Claims 17, 27, and 34 are also allowable for at least similar reasons as discussed above with regard to claim 6.

Remaining Independent Claims

It is submitted that the remaining independent claims are also allowable over Ozkan for at least similar reasons as discussed above with regard to claim 1. Moreover, Wang fails to overcome the deficiencies of Ozkan, as previously discussed.

Remaining Dependent Claims

The remaining dependent claims are also allowable by virtue of depending from allowable independent claims, and further in view of the additional features recited therein. Moreover, the attempted addition of Wang does not overcome the deficiencies in Ozkan as previously discussed.

Conclusion

All rejections having been addressed, Applicant respectfully submits that the instant application is in condition for allowance, and solicit prompt notification of the same. If the Examiner has any questions, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the number below.

Respectfully submitted,

BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

Dated: September 24, 2007

By: /Jordan N. Bodner/
Jordan N. Bodner
Registration No. 42,338

1100 13th Street, N.W.
Suite 1200
Washington, D.C. 20005
Tel: (202) 824-3000
Fax: (202) 824-3001